

# New Jersey Militia Newsletter

Vol. XXVI, Issue No. 10

April 2021

*All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of obtaining safety and happiness.*

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

## How US Capitol attack surveillance methods could be used against protestors

The FBI has relied on a variety of technologies to track down rioters in the 6 January attack on the US Capitol building – and watchdogs like the ACLU are concerned those technologies could impede protesters exercising their first amendment rights.

News coverage of the riot has largely focused on facial recognition – and how private citizens and local law enforcement officials have conducted their own facial recognition investigations in an attempt to assist the FBI with the help of social media. But the FBI also has relied on license plate readers, police body cameras and cellphone tracking.

According to Dave Maass of the Electronic Frontier Foundation, a non-profit advocating for free speech and digital privacy, the level of surveillance was “overkill”.

For example, charging documents for William Vogel of Pawling, NY, showed that “numerous tipsters” contacted the FBI when they recognized him in Snapchat videos he allegedly posted to his account during the riots.

The FBI also tracked Vogel's car from his home to the riots using automatic license plate readers. ALPRs use artificial intelligence to log the plate number of each car that passes certain cameras – which can be attached to police cars or fixed locations like street lamps. When someone registers a vehicle, their identifying information becomes associated with their license plate number, allowing law enforcement agencies to attach their identity to their car.

A 2011 survey of 70 law enforcement agencies found that almost three-quarters of agencies already had ALPRs, and that 85% planned to increase their use in the next five years.

The ACLU has fought for legislation on ALPRs because they are often used to track and store data of people who have not been accused of a crime. In Long Beach last year, a local publication reported that Pasadena and Riverside police used ALPRs to flag Black Lives Matter protest attendees.

Police body-worn cameras (BWCs) have also played a role in multiple Capitol riot investigations. While much of the discussion surrounding BWCs has

focused on surveilling police, the cameras are often instead used as a tool for police to surveil citizens.

The ACLU has recommended that BWC footage should not be permissible evidence in the case of first amendment protests. The Capitol riot does not qualify as a first amendment protest as participants illegally entered a government building. However, police are permitted to use body-camera footage as evidence to arrest protesters participating in free speech activity – if they are engaged in “unlawful conduct”.

While the surveillance tools were used to monitor the mostly white crowd in the Capitol during the riots, research and news reports have indicated that Black demonstrators are more likely to be monitored during protests, and to be arrested for protest-related infractions than white demonstrators.

Christian Davenport, a professor at the University of Michigan, led a study of more than 15,000 protests between 1960 to 1990 to find out if race was a factor in police response to protests. Researchers found: *[W]hen compared with other groups, African American protesters are more likely to draw police presence and that once police are present they are more likely to make arrests, use force and violence, and use force and violence in combination with arrests at African American protest events.*

On top of concerns about privacy and racial inequity, Maass pointed out that rather than keeping the Capitol safer at the time of the attacks, surveillance seems to have replaced real-time police work.

“I was definitely sitting in front of the computer watching live and wondering ‘where are the cops?’ No one was kicking people out,” he said. “All the surveillance in the world didn’t serve to prevent what happened ... it’s helping them clean up the mess afterwards. Surveillance is not a replacement for judgment.” – theguardian.com 7 Apr 2021

## Jan. 6 defendants win unlikely Dem champions as they face harsh detainment

Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) fled the Capitol on Jan. 6 from a mob she later called domestic terrorists. Now she and Senate Majority Whip Dick

Durbin (D-III) are standing up for their attackers' rights as criminal defendants.

Most of the 300-plus people charged with participating in the Jan. 6 Capitol riot have been released while they await trial, but dozens of those deemed to be dangerous, flight risks or at high risk of obstructing justice were ordered held without bond. D.C. jail officials later determined that all Capitol detainees would be placed in so-called restrictive housing — a move billed as necessary to keep the defendants safe, as well as guards and other inmates. But that means 23-hour-a-day isolation for the accused, even before their trials begin.

"Solitary confinement is a form of punishment that is cruel and psychologically damaging," Warren said. "And we're talking about people who haven't been convicted of anything yet."

She said that while some limited uses of solitary confinement are justified, she's worried that law enforcement officials are deploying it to "punish" the Jan. 6 defendants or to "break them so that they will cooperate."

But restrictive housing is a maximum-security designation, and the blanket designation for the Capitol defendants — which isn't expected to ease even if pandemic era restrictions do — is a notable decision for a large group of inmates who have yet to be tried for their alleged crimes.

One detained defendant — Ronald Sandlin, charged with being among the first to attempt to breach the Senate chamber, read a statement in court describing the conditions he's being held in as "mental torture."

Politico previously reported that defendant Ryan Samsel was "severely beaten" by DC correctional officers and is now "blind in one eye" and "has a skull fracture" and a "detached retina," according to his attorney.

Another defendant, 60-year-old Richard "Bigo" Barnett, who is being held in indefinite detention for putting his feet up on Pelosi's desk, was reportedly "tackled to the ground" by DC corrections officers who told him they "hate all white people."

Others have lodged complaints about access to needed medication or health monitoring, prompting intervention from judges. One, Jacob Chansley, won a transfer to a prison in Alexandria, Va., after the D.C. jail said it was too onerous to provide him organic food that he argued was necessary to comport with his spiritual practice.

Some Jan. 6 defendants have contended that there is a racial component to their treatment: Most are white — some affiliated with white nationalist groups — while most D.C. inmates and prison guards are Black.

Judge Paul Friedman said last week that those concerns are "not necessarily illegitimate."

"It may be that some of the people arrested on Jan. 6 are white supremacists" or that they're perceived to be, he added. — Based on a Politico article dated 4/15/2021

## Sixth Circuit Court Rules Bump Stocks Are Not Machine Guns

**U.S.A.** —(Ammoland.com)- Gun Owners of America (GOA), Gun Owners Foundation (GOF), the Virginia Citizens Defense League (VCDL), Matt Watkins, Tim Harmsen of the Military Arms Channel, and GOA's Texas Director, Rachel Malone, defeated the bump stock ban in the Sixth Circuit Court of appeals.

According to the government, "the term 'machinegun' means any weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger. The term shall also include the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any combination of parts designed and intended for use in converting a weapon into a machinegun, and any combination of parts from which a machinegun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person."

GOA argued that a bump stock doesn't meet the definition of a machine gun because each pull of the trigger only fires a single round. The court agreed that bump stocks are not machine guns, and the ATF has overstepped its boundaries when redefining bump stocks.

The Sixth Circuit Court said: "With or without a bump stock, a semiautomatic firearm is capable of firing only a single shot for each pull of the trigger and is unable to fire again until the trigger is released, and the hammer of the firearm is reset."

However, bump stocks are still banned.

The panel of judges from the Sixth Circuit Court sent the case back to the District Court to decide how widespread any injunction against the ban should be, but since different circuits have different rulings on the subjects any injunction will only be for Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee.

The Sixth Circuit Court denied the ATF Chevron deference. Chevron deference defers to a federal agency's interpretation of an ambiguous or unclear statute. The government argued that since the regulation wasn't clear, the ATF could determine what is and isn't a machine gun.

The Sixth Circuit Court ruled, "Chevron deference does not apply to agency interpretation of criminal statute thus the court does not need to decide whether agency can waive Chevron deference, therefore, the court must determine BEST MEANING of the statute"

The government could file for an en banc review of the case, or the government could appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States of America. An en banc review means every Sixth Circuit judge will get a say in the case. This victory is the first victory that gun rights advocates had in defending bump stocks.

-- ammoland.com March 25, 2021

## **Top Democrat Senator Dashes His Party's Push for Gun Control By Opposing Recently Passed House Bills**

Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) came out against his party's push for gun control this week, saying that he does not support bills that were recently passed in the House.

"I come from a gun culture. I'm a law-abiding gun owner," Manchin said, adding that he supports background checks on commercial transactions because the seller in that case does not know the buyer.

"If I know a person, no," Manchin added.

The push comes after a man, who was born in Syria, shot and killed 10 people at a grocery store in Boulder, Colorado, this week. Democrats seized on the tragedy to both push their far-left gun control agenda. Democrats seem uninterested in the fact that Colorado has universal background checks, which did not stop the tragedy from happening.

Leah Libresco, a former researcher at FiveThirtyEight, was a proponent of all the gun control measures that Democrats champion — gun bans, restricting suppressors, limiting magazine sizes, among others — until she and her colleagues spent three months analyzing all the gun deaths in the U.S. per year.

Back on October 10, 2017 Libresco wrote in her article titled "I used to think gun control was the answer. My research told me otherwise" the following in The Washington Post about what her research found:

"We looked at what interventions might have saved those people, and the case for the policies I'd lobbied for crumbled when I examined the evidence. The best ideas left standing were narrowly tailored interventions to protect subtypes of potential victims, not broad attempts to limit the lethality of guns."

"I researched the strictly tightened gun laws in Britain and Australia and concluded that they didn't prove much about what America's policy should be. Neither nation experienced drops in mass shootings or other gun related-crime that could be attributed to their buybacks and bans. Mass shootings were too rare in Australia for their absence after the buyback program to be clear evidence of progress. And in both Australia and Britain, the gun restrictions had an ambiguous effect on other gun-related crimes or deaths."

"As my co-workers and I kept looking at the data, it seemed less and less clear that one broad gun-control restriction could make a big difference. Two-thirds of gun deaths in the United States every year are suicides. Almost no proposed restriction would make it meaningfully harder for people with guns on hand to use them."

"By the time we published our project, I didn't believe in many of the interventions I'd heard politicians tout. I was still anti-gun, at least from the point of view of most gun owners, and I don't want a gun in my home, as I think the risk outweighs the benefits. But I can't endorse policies whose only selling point is that

gun owners hate them. Policies that often seem as if they were drafted by people who have encountered guns only as a figure in a briefing book or an image on the news."

--- [www.dailywire.com](http://www.dailywire.com) March 24, 2021

## **FPC Condemns Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Opinion Upholding Carry Ban**

The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that state governments can restrict people from openly carrying guns in public, effectively ending a person's right to bear arms outside of their home.

On March 24 the court issued an en banc opinion in the case of Young vs. Hawaii over a lawsuit by a Hawaiian resident who argued that the restrictions set by the state on his ability to openly carry a firearm was against the Constitution.

A district court ruled against George Young but a three-judge panel of the 9th Circuit Court then decided in his favor. The latest development came from the full 11-member panel, or en banc.

The appeals court cited what they saw as a longstanding tradition in English and American law that government could prohibit "certain weapons from entering... public spaces as means of providing 'domestic Tranquility' and forestalling 'domestic Violence.'"

The dissent opinion criticized the ruling for whittling down the right to bear arms to a "mere inkblot."

The National Rifle Association issued a tweet vowing to fight against the decision.

"This was not an NRA case but we are exploring all options to rectify this," the NRA said.

Joseph Greenlee, the director of constitutional studies at the Firearms Police Coalition, criticized the ruling in a statement Wednesday.

"We are very disappointed in the outcome of this case. As the dissent pointed out, the Ninth Circuit has effectively eliminated the word 'bear' from the Constitution," Greenlee said. "Now that tens of millions of Americans have been told, for the first time ever, that they have no right to carry a firearm, it is more important than ever for the Supreme Court to address the issue and define the right to 'bear arms.'"

Others, like New Jersey state Attorney General Gurbir Grewal praised the decision.

"Today the Ninth Circuit agreed that laws that limit carrying guns in public are constitutional," Grewal tweeted.

"Proud that NJ led a brief for 10 states in that case, & proud to support firearm safety laws that protect both the public & law enforcement officers," he added.

— [www.firearmspolice.org](http://www.firearmspolice.org) March 24, 2021

## **BLM Minneapolis: 'I Don't Want to Say We Need to Start Killing All White Folks... But... Maybe They Need to Feel the Pain and Hurt'**

By Cassandra Fairbanks

In a shocking collection of interviews from the George Floyd memorial in Minneapolis, far-left extremists admitted to wanting another civil war and implied that white people need to be killed.

Gonzo journalist and filmmaker Ami Horowitz interviewed several people who were attending the memorial to get their take on things like... burning the city down and using violence against white people. Their responses will surprise no one.

I went to the George Floyd memorial in Minneapolis to speak with protesters.

— Ami Horowitz (@AmiHorowitz) April 20, 2021

"Burn the whole city down, what does it matter?" one of the women asked. "I say burn the city down, y'know? So they can see that we're here," another woman asserted.

One of the women went on to say that Derek Chauvin should not have received a trial at all.

"There shouldn't even be a trial, he should be convicted just as is," she said.

The extremists were all in agreement that if he was not convicted they would support "street justice" for him, meaning murder.

One of the women said that she believed that "thousands" of unarmed black men were killed last year in the United States.

They all also seemed to agree that there is a "genocide" happening to African Americans — and "anyone who isn't white."

When asked about a second Civil War, one young woman said "if that's what it takes, then we have to do it."

Another responded, "if that's what it takes, then I believe so."

Asked if it will happen, yet another woman said "probably."

"I don't want to say we need to start killing all white folks, but it's like..." one of the militant extremists said.

"But...?" Horowitz asked.

"Maybe they need to feel the pain and the hurt," she continued.

-- www.thegatewaypundit.com April 20, 2021

## **1<sup>st</sup> Time Gun Buyers Help Push Record U.S. Gun Sales Amid String of Mass Shootings**

First time gun owners are helping to push record levels of gun sales for what looks like the second year in a row.

These buyers are white, Black, Asian, and Latino and come from all political beliefs. And they're being driven by uncertainty, fear, and a need to feel safe.

Gun sellers across the country said the pandemic and civil unrest over the last year has

pushed customers to feel they must take control of their family's protection. Fears of Congress passing new gun control legislation in the wake of a rash of mass shootings since March are also adding fuel to the buyer's craze, industry insiders said.

Burbank, Calif.-based Redstone Firearms owner Geneva Solomon said both sales at her gun store and enrollment in their firearms education classes are up.

During March 2021, the FBI completed nearly 4.7 million background checks compared 3.7 million the same month in 2020.

Most often, the first timers are purchasing a semiautomatic handgun, outpacing the second-most purchased firearm, shotguns, by a 2 to 1 margin, according to the National Shooting Sports Foundation.

Solomon who has been running California's only Black owned-gun shop since 2015, said in the last year, she's noticed an increase in the number of Black women who have come into the store to buy a gun.

Part of that interest stems from the strained relations between the Black community and police, and a real fear of dialing 911 in emergencies, she said.

In the wake of mass shootings at workplaces, grocery stores, and spas in Indianapolis; Boulder, Colo.; and Atlanta, lawmakers have called for comprehensive gun control legislation.

That effort often has an unintended effect.

"We see this trend often - whenever high profile mass shootings occur people begin stockpiling weapons out of fear that the government will restrict gun rights," said James Densley, co-founder of The Violence Project, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research center that tracks public mass shootings in the U.S.

Despite the demand, gun shops aren't recording a massive financial windfall.

The problem?

Lack of inventory, said Todd Cotta, owner of Kings Gun Center in Hanford, CA.

"I'm running on 10% of the inventory I used to run with and I can't restock it even today."

That's due, in part, to pandemic-induced inventory issues, such as shipping delays, and continued demand. Manufacturers have focused on pushing out just the most popular gun types to fulfill orders, Cotta said.

Both Solomon and Cotta said they expect a good percentage of first-time buyers (Cotta said about 20-30% and Solomon said 60%) have, or will, return to become regular customers.

And they seem to return with a boost in confidence.

"There is a sense of freedom and a feeling like they can protect themselves," Solomon said.

— www.npr.com April 26, 2021

## **China's social credit program creeps into Canada**

China's Orwellian "social credit system" that records the social and financial behaviour of individuals and corporations across China, using a vast surveillance system, is now operational at the renowned Haidilao Hot Pot restaurant in Vancouver.

Ryan Pan, a Haidilao manager confirmed that over 60 surveillance cameras have been installed in the restaurant at the request of the Haidilao corporation. He said that the restaurant has 30 tables with two cameras assigned to each table.

When asked why Haidilao required so many cameras, Ryan Pan said that the cameras were installed to “punish” staff if they didn’t adhere to corporate standards and to “people track”. Pan also said that the video is sent back to China but declined to say why, other than to say the reason for this was “secret.”

The Haidilao is located in the trendy Kitsilano district of Vancouver. The location is within walking distance of the home rented by Huawei for staff temporarily re-located to assist Meng Wanzhou, the chief financial officer (CFO) of the telecom giant. Following her arrest over a US extradition request for fraud and conspiracy to commit fraud in order to circumvent US sanctions against Iran. Haidilao has over 935 locations around the world and more than 36 million VIP members and 60,000 plus staff.

We reached out to Ivy Li, a well-known activist on matters related to China and pro-democracy, to ask why Canadians should be concerned that China’s social credit system is now operational in Canada. Ivy, who was born and raised in Hong Kong, replied: “Not only ethnic Chinese Canadians and residents, and businesses with Chinese ties are put at risk, but the privacy and safety of all Canadians and our society are compromised. The dining table in a popular restaurant is one of the best places to eavesdrop on someone and to get the pulse of a society.”

In 2020 it became mandatory for all Chinese citizens to be enrolled in the national social credit database and rated with a “social score” based on different behaviours; these “social scores” are then used to punish or reward. Praise the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) on social media and you will be given a higher score, potentially leading to benefits such as priority for school admissions, free gym services, shorter wait times at hospitals. Illegally protest against the CCP, forget to pay your utility bill, or knowingly associate with another individual who has a low score, and you might be restricted in accessing public services, excluded from taking transportation, or perhaps your children will be denied entry into the best schools.

We know that China has already started to move forward with the creation of an English language corporate social credit system version by Xinhua Credit for non-Chinese firms.

International brands must either stay silent or actively support China’s policies if they want future access to the Chinese market. Recently the boycott of H&M and other Western brands in China after they spoke out against forced labour in the cotton industry in the Xinjiang region. There is already a punishment-based system for corporations that don’t comply with the CCP regime regardless of compliance with China’s Corporate Social Credit System (CSCS).

On 9 February 2021, Director David Vigneault of Canada’s Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) said: “To be clear, the threat does not come from the Chinese people, but rather the Government of China that is pursuing a strategy for geopolitical advantage on all fronts-economic, technical, political, and military-and using all elements of state power to carry out activities that are a direct threat to our national security and sovereignty.”

Canada’s Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, has enjoyed the benefits of a very cozy relationship with China and isn’t likely to implement any significant changes to law that might affect that relationship.

Ivy Li said this in response to the Prime Minister of Canada’s apparent lack of concern over China surveillance of Canadian citizens; “CCP’s social credit system should be made illegal in Canada, and sharing our information live with a foreign regime’s suppressive surveillance system by a private business should be a criminal offence.”

-- TSG Sunday Guardian Live. April 17, 2021

## **Supreme Court agrees to take up major Second Amendment case**

The Supreme Court will consider the scope of the Second Amendment next term in a case concerning a New York law that restricts an individual from carrying a concealed handgun in public.

Not since 2008 have the justices ruled on a significant case concerning the right to bear arms, when the court held that the Second Amendment protects an individual’s right to keep and bear arms at home for self-defense. Except for a follow up decision two years later, the justices have largely stayed away from the issue, infuriating gun rights advocates and even some of the justices themselves.

"If a lower court treated another right so cavalierly, I have little doubt that this Court would intervene," Thomas wrote in a 2018 case. "But as evidenced by our continued inaction in this area, the 2nd Amendment is a disfavored right in this Court."

The 2008 majority opinion in *District of Columbia v. Heller* was penned by the late Justice Antonin Scalia, a conservative whose opinion has faced renewed scrutiny in recent weeks as the country grapples with a spate of deadly mass shootings.

Scalia, joined by four fellow conservatives, delved into the "originalist" understanding of the Framers in the 18th Century and concluded that the Second Amendment extended to private citizens -- a departure from how federal judges generally regarded the amendment as covering state militia, such as National Guards.

But Scalia’s also noted some exceptions, for example, regarding concealed weapons. "(T)he majority of the 19th-century courts to consider the question held that prohibitions on carrying concealed weapons were lawful under the Second Amendment or state analogues," he wrote.

As the court reviews the case, there could be some federal action on the issue, with Democrats, including President Joe Biden, pushing Congress to

enact tighter gun restrictions in an effort to prevent more shootings.

The new case, *NY State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Corlett*, concerns a NY law governing licenses to carry concealed handguns in public. It requires a resident to show he has what New York calls an "actual and articulable" need to do so.

NY Attorney General Letitia James said in court papers that since the Supreme Court cases *Heller* and the later *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, courts have held that the right to carry firearms in public is not unlimited and can be subject to regulatory measures consistent "with longstanding limitations on that right."

NY law requires applicants to carry the handgun in public without restriction to show an "actual and articulable -- rather than merely speculative or specious -- need for self-defense."

The petitioners are Robert Nash, Brandon Koch and the NY State Rifle and Pistol Association. They are represented by Paul Clement, who served as solicitor general during the Bush administration.

In court papers, Clement urged the justices to step in, arguing that the "single most important unresolved Second Amendment question" is whether an individual has a right to bear arms for self-defense "where confrontations often occur: outside the home." Clement argued that the law makes it almost impossible for an ordinary individual to obtain a license. "Good, even impeccable, moral character plus a simple desire to exercise a fundamental right is," Clement said, "not sufficient." "Nor is living or being employed in a high crime area," he said.

Nash requested to carry a handgun for self-defense after a string of robberies in his neighborhood. But he was denied because he did not demonstrate a special need for self-defense. Koch wanted a similar license, and he was able to cite his experience of participating in safety training courses. He too was denied.

– CNN April 26, 2021

## The Davos Revolution and the Re-Making of Civilization

The Great Reset dangles before us: a global public-private partnership that follows the mystic path of social feelings, the holy writ of consensus politics, and the self-anointed prophets of international finance... all watched over by the priests of digital technology. It's the operating system of the collective New Age, an algorithmic-technocratic revolution – maximum efficiency for managed harmony – and it's all for the "greater good."

The World Economic Forum brings together governors of central banks, international financiers, heads-of-state, UN leaders, CEOs from the largest corporations, and media personalities. To be a "Davos Man" typically means you've embraced an international perspective, and have the ability to influence long-term shifts in political and economic culture. You're part of an elite club with the self-anointed task of *directing* global change.

The last week of January 2021 witnessed the WEF's virtual conference titled the *Davos Agenda* which focused on The Great Reset.

Not everybody was on the same page as the WEF. For example, Benjamin Netanyahu told how he cut through the red tape to ensure his nation had the Covid supplies it needed. His approach didn't fit with the WEF consensus of "vaccine solidarity." The phrase "vaccine nationalism" was used, a disparaging those who sought national health goals above global collaboration.

Brazil's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ernesto Araujo said that Brazil desired an open economy based on liberty, noting that this would challenge the global emergence of a rising "techno-totalitarianism."

The Great Reset was missing "freedom and democracy," Araujo added.

Most others, however, were either on-board or otherwise playing the game.

President of China, Xi Jinping stressed that we must "abandon ideological prejudice and jointly follow a path of peaceful coexistence."

China was often applauded during the *Davos Agenda*, being admired for its digital leap forward.

But the UN Secretary General pointed to the growing rift between China and the U.S., noting that both countries were dividing the world with their separate agendas

Ursula von der Leyen, the President of the European Commission slapped the former Trump administration, saying, "democracy itself might have been permanently damaged in the last four years." And like others throughout the week, she linked Covid with climate change.

With the Reset in mind, the *Davos Agenda* focused on seven interlocking subjects: "How to Save the Planet," "Fairer Economies," "Tech for Good," "Society & Future of Work," "Better Business," "Healthy Futures," and "Beyond Geopolitics."

Maybe the concerns expressed by Brazil's Foreign Minister – the looming dangers of a rising techno-totalitarianism – are worth considering.

-- By Carl Teichrib forcingchange.org

**NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650**

ISSN 1523-4657

Back issues, from 1995 to date, can be found online. Just go to <https://archive.org/> Select search metadata, and enter New Jersey Militia. Or do a google search for "New Jersey Militia Newsletter". So, grab the PDFs and pass them around via email.

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Sorry, no bank account - Cash or blank MO only

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_